PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	**Amount Requested**	$2,000,000
Proposal Title	Upper Sand Creek Basin	**Total Proposal Cost**	$14,079,000

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project includes the construction of a 900 acre-foot capacity stormwater detention basin, channel improvements, and inlet and spillway structures to provide regional flood protection to areas in the Cities of Antioch, Brentwood, and Oakley. The Project will provide stormwater attenuation, infiltration, trash capture, environmental enhancement of 3,500 linear feet of Sand Creek and will also create a seasonal wetlands and riparian habitat fed by urban runoff.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**12/15**	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	**9/12**
Budget	**4/5**	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	**6/12**
Schedule	**3/5**	Program Preferences	**6/10**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**4/5**		
		Total Score (max. possible = 64)	**44**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed, but is not supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and partly lacks logical rationale. The purpose and need of the project is lacking. The tasks provide brief descriptions of the work, the current status and the associated deliverables. Potential negative impacts of not constructing the project are listed as: Delta water supply impacts, local flood damages, and ecosystem degradation and fragmentation. However, the impacts are only briefly described and do not adequately characterize need. Also, task detail is not sufficient. For example, Task 4 – Construction/ Implementation Tasks only list the construction tasks without a description of the process or methodology implemented.

Budget

The Budget has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 and the costs are considered reasonable, but the supporting documentation for some of the Budget categories of Exhibit B is not fully supported. The funding match total is incorrect; it should be $12,129,000 ($50k more than what is shown). There were other calculation errors in Tasks 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 5.2, but none impacted the total Project cost. There is no supporting detail or explanation of how the lump sum costs were estimated in Tasks 4 and 5.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation between six and 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). Although the Schedule shows a Construction/Implementation start date of Dec 1, 2011, this is the date they will begin the Advertise for Bids task. The contract is scheduled to be awarded on March 30, 2012, and the Notice to Proceed is scheduled to occur on May 1, 2012, which is 7 months after the anticipated award date.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Detail for monitoring some project goals is lacking. For example, The "Improve Water Quality" Measurement and Target only addresses trash reduction; however, the outcome indicator for this goal is the amount of pollutants removed by the detention basin. Additional water quality monitoring is necessary to evaluate any change in concentrations of pollutants. Also, some output indicators do not effectively track output. For example, the output indicator for the Primary Project Goal, *Reduce Flood Risk*, is "reduction in the number of flood events that overtop bank downstream." This should be an outcome, not an output. The Target for the same goal, "measurable reduction in flood events downstream of site" is not specific or measurable.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

High levels of FDR and Water Supply benefits could be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. The data sources and valuation approach used to generate the FDR benefits are not well documented.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water quality benefits are described briefly, but no physical or economic quantification is provided. Benefits from a potential park are not part of this proposed project. Property value improvement is not a separate benefit.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Contribute to Attainment of One or More of the Objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Practice Integrated Flood Management, and Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.